

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent. Claims 2-14 and 16-17 depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 1.

**Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 1 and 15 were amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 has been canceled. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,561,461 ("Landis") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0237100 ("Piotrowski"). Claims 2-3, 14, and 16-17 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 15. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed to a broadcast reception device comprising reception means for receiving a broadcast signal and time information acquisition means for acquiring a current time from a broadcast signal by, for example, the EDS system. The time information acquisition means include signal extraction means and search means for searching for said time information from the designated broadcast signal extracted by said signal extraction means. The claimed invention further includes processing means for designating a channel

unsearched and deciding whether to perform an acquisition operation in the event that the search means do not indicate a decision with respect to a search performed on the desired channel. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, requires, in part, "processing means for designating a channel unsearched by said search means for said time information and causing said time information acquisition means to perform the acquisition operation."

The Examiner argues that independent claim 1, as amended, is obvious over Landis in view of Piotrowski. With respect to the above limitation of claim 1, as amended, the Examiner asserts that Landis teaches processing means for designating a channel unsearched by said search means for said time information and causing said time information acquisition means to perform the acquisition operation. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Landis discloses scanning all active channels in order to identify a reliable EDS data source, but is completely silent with respect to designating whether or not specific channels have been scanned previously. Thus, Landis fails to disclose that the device includes "processing means for designating a channel unsearched by said search means." Further, Piotrowski is also completely silent with respect to "designating a channel unsearched."

In view of the above, Landis and Piotrowsky, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Landis and Piotrowsky. Independent claim 15 contains at least the same patentable limitations as claim 1, and, thus, is also patentable over Landis and Piotrowsky for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, the Examiner acknowledges that "Landis fails to teach wherein when a desired channel is newly selected, said time information acquisition means cancels the acquisition operation currently performed and performs a new acquisition operation with respect

to said desired channel that is newly selected” in the Office Action mailed May 17, 2007. Piotrowski also fails to show or suggest at least this limitation.

The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Landis’ reception device to include updating the time information every time the user changes channels, as taught by Piotrowski. However, the claimed limitation requires that the “time information acquisition means cancels the acquisition operation currently performed” and then starts a new operation. Piotrowski discloses starting a new operation, but fails to disclose the limitation that the time information means cancel the current operation. Specifically, Piotrowski does not rule out the possibility of concurrent acquisition operations. Thus, the receiver according to Piotrowski may continue the acquisition operations on the current channel in addition to starting a new operation on the new channel. In this case, the Examiner’s line of reasoning fails to definitively show that Piotrowski’s method cancels the old operation, as required by claim 1. Thus, for at least these additional reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 4-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landis in view of Piotrowski, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,323 (“Lawler”). Claims 4-13 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Landis and Piotrowsky, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1. Further, Lawler does not provide that which Landis and Piotrowsky lack with respect to claim 1. Lawler is completely silent with respect to both designating a channel unsearched and canceling a current acquisition operation and performing a new acquisition operation. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentable over Landis, Piotrowsky, and Lawler, whether considered separately or in

combination. Dependent claims 4-13 are patentable over Landis, Piotrowsky, and Lawler for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04536/022001).

Dated: September 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant